

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 through 68 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 66 through 68 are newly added with this amendment.

Claims 1 through 65 are rejected.

**Double Patenting Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,506,628**

Claims 1 through 15 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 15 of U.S. Patent 6,506,628. In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of the present application by filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321 (b) and (c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimer should not be construed as acquiescence in the Examiner's double patenting or obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Attached are the terminal disclaimer and accompanying fee.

**Double Patenting Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,706,559**

Claims 1 through 15 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 15 of U.S. Patent 6,706,559. In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of the present application by filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321 (b) and (c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimer should not be construed as acquiescence in the Examiner's double patenting or obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Attached are the terminal disclaimer and accompanying fee.

**Double Patenting Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,017,776**

Claims 1 through 15, 16 through 28, 29 through 40, 41 through 47, 48 through 53, and 54 through 65 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 20, 21 through 39, 40 through 51, 54, and 56 of U.S. Patent 6,017,776. In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of the present application by filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate

the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321 (b) and (c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimer should not be construed as acquiescence in the Examiner's double patenting or obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Attached are the terminal disclaimer and accompanying fee.

**Double Patenting Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,200,833**

Claims 1 through 65 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 45 of U.S. Patent 6,200,833. In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of the present application by filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321 (b) and (c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimer should not be construed as acquiescence in the Examiner's double patenting or obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Attached are the terminal disclaimer and accompanying fee.

**Double Patenting Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,312,977**

Claims 1 through 65 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 45 of U.S. Patent 6,312,977. In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of the present application by filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321 (b) and (c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimer should not be construed as acquiescence in the Examiner's double patenting or obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Attached are the terminal disclaimer and accompanying fee.

**Double Patenting Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,706,559**

Claims 16 through 28, 29 through 40, 41 through 53, and 54 through 65 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16, 19 through 30, 31, 34 through 44, 1 through 6, 14, 16 through 19, 26, 27, and 29 through 40, respectively, of U.S. Patent 6,706,559. In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of the present application by filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321 (b) and

(c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimer should not be construed as acquiescence in the Examiner's double patenting or obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Attached are the terminal disclaimer and accompanying fee.

**Objections to Claims 48 through 53 and 54 through 65**

Claims 48 through 53 and 54 through 65 stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 16 through 19, 26 through 27, and 29 through 40.

Applicants assert that independent claims 16 and 48 are not substantial duplicates of each other. Independent claim 16 requires "applying an adhesive in a wet film state in a form of one of a liquid and a paste in a predetermined pattern to at least a portion of the active surface of more than one acceptable semiconductor die after the more than one acceptable semiconductor die has been identified using the criteria" while presently amended independent claim 28 requires "applying an adhesive in a predetermined pattern in a wet film state in a form of one of a liquid and a paste in a predetermined pattern to the at least one lead of the plurality of leads of the lead frame and the active surface of the acceptable semiconductor die after an acceptable semiconductor die has been identified using the criteria". Further, Applicants assert that independent claims 29 and 54 are not duplicates. Independent claim 29 requires "identifying acceptable criteria of a semiconductor die of the plurality of semiconductor dice, identifying including one of identifying the criteria before the semiconductor die is separated from the semiconductor wafer and identifying the criteria for the acceptable semiconductor die after the semiconductor die is separated from a semiconductor wafer" while presently amended independent claim 54 requires "using acceptable criteria of a semiconductor die of the plurality of semiconductor dice, identifying including one of identifying the criteria before the semiconductor die is separated from a semiconductor wafer and identifying the criteria after the semiconductor die is separated from a semiconductor wafer for identifying an acceptable semiconductor die having the acceptable criteria". Therefore, such independent claims and the dependent claims therefrom are allowable.

### ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to claims 1 through 68 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application under 35 U.S.C. § 132.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1 through 68 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: January 13, 2005  
JRD/nj:lmh  
Document in ProLaw